

**WILLIAMSBURG
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
Special Meeting
Tuesday, October 5, 2005**

CALL TO ORDER AND ATTENDANCE

The Architectural Review Board special meeting was held on Wednesday, October 5, 2005, at 7:00 p.m. in the Council Chamber of the Stryker Building.

Chairman Williams called the meeting to order. Present in addition to Mr. Williams were Board members Mr. Klee, Mr. Watson, Mr. Spence and Mr. Hertzler. Board member Mr. Lane was absent. Also present was Planning Director Nester and Zoning Administrator Murphy.

Mr. Williams noted the special meeting was for the following three cases which were scheduled for a public hearing:

PCR #05-026: Revision of Chapter 21, Zoning, of the Williamsburg City Code, by revising Article IX, Architectural Review, to add three sub-areas to the Architectural Preservation District Map [Sec. 21-851]; to add the procedure for the adoption of the Design Review Guidelines [Sec. 21-853(h)]; and to delete the requirement that Planned Unit Developments approved prior to October 10, 1991 and located outside of the Architectural Preservation (AP) and Corridor Protection (CP) Districts be required to have building designs approved by the Architectural Review Board [Sec. 21-864].

PCR #05-027: Revision of Chapter 21, Zoning, of the Williamsburg City Code, by amending the Official Zoning Map, Architectural Review Districts, to revise the boundaries of the Architectural Preservation District (AP) and the Corridor Protection District (CP), and to establish three zones relating to design review guidelines in the AP District (AP-1, AP-2 and AP-3).

ARB #05-073: Revision of the Design Review Guidelines, which are used by the Architectural Review Board in reviewing requests for the erection, reconstruction, alteration, restoration, razing, demolition or moving of buildings, structures, signs and/or exterior architectural features in the Architectural Preservation (AP) and Corridor Protection (CP) Districts.

He noted after a brief review of the cases by staff the Board would opened the public hearing for comments from members in the audience.

Reed Nester, Planning Director, reviewed PCR #05-026 and PCR #05-027 noting the changes proposed for the Zoning Ordinance and the Zoning Map.

Carolyn Murphy, Zoning Administrator, reviewed the proposed changes to the Design Review Guidelines noting the changes proposed for the three sub-areas, the Corridor

Protection District, demolition of structures, eliminating the list of Locally Significant Architecture and Areas, adding a list of historic structures and areas on the National Register of Historic Places and potential National Register individual nominations and historic districts based on the Reconnaissance Architectural Survey Report (1992), adding a inventory list of buildings 50 years old or older and adding gasoline canopies to the Corridor Protection District.

Mr. Williams opened the public hearing.

Victor Smith, 140 Chandler Court expressed a concern with removing Planned Unit Developments from review by the City's Architectural Review Board due to the number of individuals on the small boards in these neighborhoods making decisions that change the façade of a neighborhood thereby affecting the City. He proposed changing the guidelines by allowing homeowners the chance to appeal the decision of the neighborhood review board to the City's Architectural Review Board.

John Digges, 512 South Henry Street thanked the Board for their efforts to protect the City but thought the Design Review Guidelines don't go far enough. He expressed the following:

- Siding doesn't always determine if a building looks good or not that the trim, windows, doors and other details determines the look of a building.
- Alternative materials may be acceptable for these details.
- A vinyl siding building could look very good with the proper trim.
- Good wood was hard to come by these days.
- Alternative materials should be reviewed by the Board to keep up with the times.
- Architects should be given an opportunity to present different materials or products to the Board.
- A mechanism should be built in to review new materials.

Mr. Williams noted that the Board reviews alternative materials on a regular basis from different manufactures such as windows and siding and that based on a specific proposal the Board has accepted alternative materials.

Harry Hart, 141 Rolfe Road expressed a concern with the Board difficulty in the use of cement board. He reviewed provisions in the Uniform Statewide Building Code (USBC) and said that he felt that they superseded the Architectural Review Board authority in regulating siding and read the code section.

Mr. Nester said a locality has the right to regulate Historic Districts and that the Architectural Review Board was a part of the City's Zoning Ordinance. He noted staff would check with the City Attorney to verify this position.

David Mutter, 240 Brookwood Drive asked what the Corridor Protection District means.

Mr. Nester explained the purpose of the Corridor Protection District and provided examples of the proposed changes to the District. He noted the Corridor Protection District was established to protect and enhance the historic character of the Colonial Williamsburg Historic Area and the architectural preservation district by ensuring that the major access corridors to these areas are developed and maintained in a harmonious and compatible manner. He noted the boundaries are one lot deep from the corridor or 500 feet if a parcel was very large such as Holly Hills Carriage Homes before the development.

Charlie Fannin, 114 Mimosa Drive expressed a concern with 104, 106 and 110 Mimosa Drive being located in an Architectural Preservation District because these structures don't have any historic value due to remodeling about 20 years ago. He noted the siding, windows and foundations have been altered.

Mr. Williams responded that these houses were added to the District from a meeting with a neighbor who noted these structures were old and should be included in the District thus notices were mailed to homeowners to give them an opportunity to express their views on their addition.

Mr. Klee added that this area was part of a neighborhood that was vanishing; addition of the structures to the District reflected "what was on the ground".

Mrytle Engs, 375-612 Merrimac Trail expressed a concern with development along Capitol Landing Road and the trees being removed and how that could be allowed by the Architectural Review Board.

Mr. Nester explained that the developments along Capitol Landing Road were regulated by the Zoning Ordinance through the site plan process with the Architectural Review Board approving the design of the buildings.

Phil Craig, 501 Richmond Road expressed a concern with properties having some type of synthetic siding such as aluminum siding and have to use wood or cementitious siding for small additions. He thought that matching the same siding on a building for a small addition was better than introducing another siding material.

Carol Haas, 376-212 Merrimac Trail was concerned with the removal of Shellis Square from review by the Architectural Review Board and asked if Barclay Square would be removed.

Mr. Nester noted that Barclay Square was adjacent to the Colonial Parkway which would keep this neighborhood in the Corridor Protection District. He noted that Shellis Square was removed because it was a Planned Unit Development and as such did not need reviewing such as the Village of Woodshire and Colonial Pines Apartments.

Victor Smith, 140 Chandler Court expressed a concern with the removal of old, very large trees in the City and that the City should have a historic tree list.

Ms. Murphy explained tree removal permits were required for trees in a Chesapeake Bay Preservation Area, tree required on an approved site plan or other development plan. She also noted that the City Code allowed City Council the authority to adopt a heritage tree list.

Cheryl Foster, 511 Tyler Street asked why exterior muntins are important for windows.

Ms. Murphy noted that traditionally if windows contained muntins they were true divided light muntins with each pane of glass being enclosed with wood. Therefore muntins are an important feature of windows to preserve the historic quality of windows.

Mr. Klee explained the Secretary of Interior Standards which has a hierarchy for materials with retention of what you have as the best preservation method.

John Digges, 512 South Henry Street noted that 90% of windows manufactured today have the muntins between the panes of glass, exterior muntins are hard to maintain and that these types of windows are not important.

Cheryl Foster, 511 Tyler Street asked the Board to consider allowing windows between the panes of glass in the AP-2 district and if the trim around the windows could be something other than wood.

Mr. Williams noted the Design Review Guidelines currently has different window standards with an unique combination of features to provide a range of criteria related to the home's history and location.

Mr. Williams thanked everyone for their comments and noted that the Board would review the issues raised at the meeting and will forward ***Design Review Guidelines*** to Planning Commission for a public hearing at their November 16th meeting. He noted that Planning Commission would review and forward their recommendation to City Council for their review and final adoption of the ***Design Review Guidelines***.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:20 P.M.

Carolyn A. Murphy
Zoning Administrator